

REMARKS

The Claim Objections

The Applicants have revised the claims in response to the Examiner's objections. Accordingly, these objections are, respectfully speaking, moot.

The Section 112 Rejections

Though Applicants disagree and traverse the Examiner's position, in order to facilitate further substantive examination of the claims the Applicants have revised the claims in response to the Examiner's rejections without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the original form of these claims. Applicants reserve their right to further traverse these rejections at a later date, if necessary.

The Section 101 Rejections

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, the Examiner taking the position that claims 1 and 9 fail to establish a tangible, concrete and useful result. Applicants disagree and traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Certainly the establishment of a trusted two-way link is a tangible, useful and concrete result. That said, and without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the original form of claims 1 and 9, Applicants have amended these claims to more particularly point out and describe their subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-14.

The Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudbjartsson et al, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0027519 (“Gudbjartsson”) and Reed et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,862,325 (“Reed”). Applicants disagree and request reconsideration of the Examiner’s rejections for at least the following reasons.

Putting aside for present purposes (to simplify Applicants’ present response) Applicants’ belief that the Examiner has improperly combined Gudbjartsson and Reed, Applicants note that Gudbjartsson does not disclose or suggest an authentication server adapted to establish a two-way trusted communication link for access by an authenticated user to a list of application servers associated with a client identifier.

In the Office Action the Examiner refers to paragraphs 30 and 56 of Gudbjartsson as supposedly disclosing the claimed client identifiers. Applicants disagree. The “personal identifiers” sent from many users discussed in Gudbjartsson are used to form a single password (see paragraph 50 in Gudbjartsson) in such a way that the original users’ identities are kept secret from an entity that receives the combined password. As such, these personal identifiers have little or nothing to do with a list of application servers or access to such a list of servers as in the claims of the present invention. Further, Reed does not make up for the deficiencies of Gudbjartsson as acknowledged by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present application was filed upon reading the disclosures of Gudbjartsson and Reed because taken separately, or in combination, neither reference discloses or suggests an authentication server that both establishes

a two-way trusted communication link and allows an authenticated user access to a list of application servers associated with a client identifier, as in the claims of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1-14.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John E. Curtin at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3777 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

CAPITOL PATENT & TRADEMARK LAW FIRM, PLLC.

By



John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602
P.O. Box 1995
Vienna, Virginia 22183
(703) 266-3330